

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/944,166	OKAYAMA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jakieda R Jackson	2655

All Participants:

Status of Application: Pending

(1) Jakieda R Jackson.

(3) ____.

(2) Louis Woo.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 28 June 2005

Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 U.S.C. 101 rejection drawn to a program as recited in the preamble and as such are non-statutory subject matter.

Claims discussed:

11 and 14-16

Prior art documents discussed:

NONE

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner allowed all claims except claims 11 and 14-16, which are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Examiner called representing attorney, Louis Woo, to get authorization to make an examiner's amendment. Examiner suggested for the claims to read a computer-readable program stored on/embodied on a computer readable medium/media instead of claiming a computer-readable program which is not descriptive material per se and is not statutory because it is not capable of causing functional change in the computer. Attorney disagreed in which there was not an agreement reached..